UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS CIVIL ACTION NO. 04 11539 JLT

)
WALTER STICKLE, ANTHONY)
CALIENDO, JOHN PITINGOLO, and)
DANIEL FISHER,)
Plaintiffs)
)
v.)
)
ARTHUR ORFANOS,)
Defendant)
)

DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO AND OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'_ PROPOSED "ORDER" FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

NOW comes Defendant, Plaintiff in Counterclaims (Defendant), in accordance with all applicable rules, regulations and procedures, as well as the Honorable Judge Tauro's verbal direction on September 29, 2004, to respectfully object to and oppose Plaintiff's proposed "ORDER" for Preliminary Injunction (Order) as follows:

- 1. Said Order is unjustifiable, excessive, inequitable and otherwise unjust.
- 2. Said Order cannot be issued because Plaintiffs fail, neglect and refuse to meet the requisite burden of proof in the instant matter because Plaintiffs cannot substantiate their claims, cannot meet the requisite burden of proof, cannot demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits, and do not stand to be irreparably harmed, no injunctive relief is available. See, e.g., <u>Camel Hair and Cashmere Institute of</u>

 America, Inc. v. <u>Associated Dry Goods Corporation</u>. 799 F. 2d 6, 12 (1stCir. 1986).
- 3. Defendant is the true, lawful owner of the intellectual property at issue in the

discussed changing the band name and Defendant consequently registered related domain names. Defendant initially registered www.pinkvoyd.com on or about May 23, 2001. Under duress, he transferred same to Plaintiff. Defendant applied to USPTO to register Pink Voyd in 2002, and also in 2004 to use same; he was informed in 2004 he was the owner of the Pink Voyd mark. Id. Defendant's Counterclaims

against Plaintiffs reserve and establish his claims for same, but in a forum he wished

to and affirmatively acted strongly to avoid. Id. Because Defendant is the rightful

user of the mark "Pink Voyd", he is not liable under \$1125(d).

registered related domain names. Later, in 2000 – 2001, the band The Mood

- 4. Plaintiffs' Order, if granted, would violate Defendant's rights to due process because, amongst other things, there exists irreparable harm to Defendant through Plaintiff's continued use of Defendant's intellectual property and Defendant has claimed same in his counterclaims against Plaintiffs; The forum for such determinations is a trial, not a Motion Hearing or through injunctive relief. *See, e.g.*, 14th Amendment, US Constitution.
- 5. Because Plaintiffs have used and continue to use business practices and

2

entertainment methodologies which are the same as or similar to those created by Defendant and which mislead the public, Plaintiffs must immediately cease and desist from improperly using and otherwise illegally benefiting from Defendant's intellectual property, See, e.g., Defendant's Exhibit 22; Plaintiffs must thus forthwith:

Case 1:04-cv-11539-JLT

- A. Cease and desist from all and any further use of Pink Voyd name in all capacities (websites, performances, advertisings, other);
- B. Cease and desist from all and any further use of Defendant's intellectual and other properties, materials, concepts of laser lights / multi color light shows / visual effects in the form of, amongst other things, video screening(s) as Pink Floyd displays, placing portions of the white "Brick wall" on stage replicating Pink Floyd's wall, and other;
- C. Cease and desist from all and any further use of photos of the Defendant's sound system, laser light show and slide show advertised on the Pinkvoyd.com site which are the same exact light show and photos created by Defendant and used by Defendant's group "The Mood." See, e.g., Defendant's Exhibit 19;
- D. Cease and desist from all and any further use of Defendant's intellectual property in their electronic, telecommunications and other media ("The printout from Pinkvoyd.com, "The Mood" [is] listed in the [Pink Voyd] META TAG", See, e.g., Defendant's Exhibit 28;
- E. Cease and desist from all and any further use of Defendant's "same exact sound system specific to [Defendant's] IP (with "The Mood" stenciled on it)", See Defendant's Affidavit # 82;;

6. The parties should be Ordered to mediate, arbitrate or otherwise resolve their claims outside of a trial forum; Defendant has requested same in writing on at least two (2) separate occasions, but Plaintiffs' response was to file the instant lawsuit.

In further support hereof, please see Defendant's Answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint and Counterclaims, as well as all documents, Exhibits and other attached thereto and incorporated therein.

WHEREFORE Defendant respectfully requests this Honorable Court consider the aforementioned points, as well as Defendant's oral arguments on September 29, 2004, and Order fair and equitable relief herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Defendant

By his Attorney

The Law Offices of Mark E. Pelosky, P.C.

Mark E. Pelosky, Esq.

The Law Offices of Mark E. Pelosky, P.C.

379 Broadway Suite 207

Chelsea, MA 02150 617 884 8100

October 7, 2004

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 04 11539 JLT

	1
WALTER STICKLE, ANTHONY	<i>,</i>
CALIENDO, JOHN PITINGOLO, and)
DANIEL FISHER,)
Plaintiffs)
)
v.)
A DELIVID OPE ANOC)
ARTHUR ORFANOS,)
Defendant)
)

AFFIDVIT / CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mark E. Pelosky, Esq., of The Law Offices of Mark E. Pelosky, P.C., attorney for Defendant hereby depose under oath I have this day caused the following:

DEFENDANT'S OBJECTION TO AND OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED "ORDER" FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

AFFIDVAIT / CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

To be served upon Plaintiff's Counsel Michael B Newman, Clark Hunt and Embry, 55 Cambridge Parkway, Cambridge, MA 02142 by facsimile only to 617 494 1921.

Subscribed and sworn to under the pains and penalties of perjury on this 8th day of October, 2004.

Mark E. Pelosky, Esq.

The Law Offices of Mark E. Pelosky, P.C.